arXiv:1606.02264v1 [math.CO] 7 Jun 2016

Perfect state transfer is poly-time

Gabriel Coutinho*
Dep. Ciência da Computação
IME-USP
São Paulo, SP, Brazil
coutinho@ime.usp.br

Chris Godsil†
Dep. Combinatorics and Optimization
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON, Canada
cgodsil@uwaterloo.ca

June 8, 2016

Abstract

We show that deciding whether a graph admits perfect state transfer can be done in polynomial time with respect to the size of the graph on a classical computer.

Keywords: Perfect state transfer; quantum walks; spectral graph theory.
MSC: 81P68; 05C50; 15A16.

1 Introduction

Since the seminal papers by Bose [3] and Christandl et al. [8], it is safe to say that over 500 papers have been published in physics, computer science and mathematics journals concerning the topic of state transfer over continuous-time quantum walk models. From the combinatorics point of view, there has been a remarkable effort in characterizing simple graphs for which perfect state transfer occurs according to the adjacency matrix or Laplacian matrix models. State transfer has been studied in distance-regular graphs (Coutinho et al. [10], Jafarizadeh and Sufiani [18]), graph products and alike structures

*Acknowledges the support of grants FAPESP 15/16339-2 and FAPESP 13/03447-6.
†Acknowledges the support of NSERC Grant RGPIN-9439.

(Ge et al. [12], Coutinho and Godsil [10], Pal and Bhattacharjya [20], Ackelsberg et al. [1]), weighted paths (Kay [19], Vinet and Zhedanov [21]), Cayley graphs for abelian groups (Cheung and Godsil [7], Chan [5], Bašić[2]), and trees (Coutinho and Liu [11]), among other examples.

However, to the best of our knowledge, the classical complexity and related computation aspects of determining when perfect state transfer occurs in simple graphs has not been studied. This is the topic of this paper.

2 The hardness of perfect state transfer

Let M be a symmetric integer matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by a finite set V of n elements, and whose spectral decomposition is given by

$$M = \sum_{r=0}^{d} \theta_r E_r,$$

where the θ_r's are the distinct eigenvalues of M.

If $a, b \in V$, we say that M admits perfect state transfer between a and b if there is a time $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$|\exp(\mathrm{i}\tau M)_{a,b}| = 1.$$

Denote by $\mathbf{e}_a$ the vector whose entires are indexed by V with its ath entry equal to 1, and all the remaining equal to 0. A necessary condition (see Godsil [15, Lemma 5.1]) for perfect state transfer to occur is that, for all r,

$$E_r \mathbf{e}_a = \pm E_r \mathbf{e}_b.$$

When this occurs, we say that a and b are strongly cospectral. The eigenvalue support of a, denoted by Θ_a, is the set of eigenvalues of M whose projection of $\mathbf{e}_a$ onto the corresponding eigenspace is not 0, that is

$$\Theta_a = \{\theta_r : E_r \mathbf{e}_a \neq 0\}.$$

If M is a matrix that encodes the adjacency of a graph, say the adjacency or the Laplacian matrix, we say that the graph admits perfect state transfer between the corresponding vertices, or that such vertices are strongly cospectral, with respect to the quantum walk model determined by M.

In this paper, we show the following result, which can be notably applied for the cases where M is the adjacency matrix or the Laplacian matrix of a graph.

2.1 Theorem. *For any $n \times n$ symmetric integer matrix M whose entries belong to*[1] *$[-n, n]$, deciding whether or not M admits perfect state transfer can be done in polynomial time in n.*

To show this result, we make use of the following characterization of perfect state transfer.

2.2 Theorem. *(see Coutinho [9, Theorem 2.4.4]) If M is a symmetric integer matrix and two of its columns are indexed by a and b, and if $\theta_0 > ... > \theta_k$ are the eigenvalues in Θ_a, then M admits perfect state transfer between a and b if and only if the following conditions hold.*

(a) Columns a and b are strongly cospectral.

(b) Columns a and b are periodic, or equivalently (see Godsil [15, Theorem 6.1]), non-zero elements of Θ_a are either all integers or all quadratic integers. Moreover, there is a square-free integer Δ, an integer p, and integers $q_0, ..., q_k$ such that

$$\theta_r = \frac{p + q_r\sqrt{\Delta}}{2} \ , \quad \textit{for all } r = 0, ..., k.$$

(c) Let $g = \gcd\{(\theta_0 - \theta_r)/\sqrt{\Delta}\}_{r=0}^{k}$. Then

(a) $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = E_r\mathbf{e}_b$ if and only if $(\theta_0 - \theta_r)/(g\sqrt{\Delta})$ is even, and

(b) $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = -E_r\mathbf{e}_b$ if and only if $(\theta_0 - \theta_r)/(g\sqrt{\Delta})$ is odd.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, the minimum time perfect state transfer occurs is $\pi/(g\sqrt{\Delta})$. □

In order to decide whether perfect state transfer occurs, we must check all three conditions above. On the course of the following results, we will show how each of the conditions can be independently checked in polynomial time.

Let $\phi(x)$ be the characteristic polynomial of M, and if $T \subset V$, let $\phi_T(x)$ be the characteristic polynomial of the matrix obtained from M by removing the rows and columns indexed by T. Recall that the complexity of computing the characteristic polynomial is the same as computing the determinant.

[1] Or, more generally, entries whose absolute values are bounded by a polynomial in n.

2.3 Lemma. *For $j \in \{0, ..., d\}$, the multiplicity of θ_j as a pole of $\phi_T(x)/\phi(x)$ is equal to the rank of $(E_j)_{T,T}$.*

Proof. The following identity is due to Jacobi (see for instance Godsil [13, Section 4.1]):

$$\det[(xI - M)^{-1}]_{T,T} = \frac{\phi_T(x)}{\phi(x)}.$$

On the other hand, using the spectral decomposition of M, it follows that

$$[(xI - M)^{-1}]_{T,T} = \sum_{r=0}^{d} \frac{1}{x - \theta_r}(E_r)_{T,T}.$$

Let us just denote $F_r = \frac{1}{x-\theta_r}(E_r)_{T,T}$ and $H = \sum_{r \neq j} F_r$. Now let P be an orthogonal matrix that diagonalizes F_j to a diagonal matrix D. It follows that

$$\frac{\phi_T(x)}{\phi(x)} = \det\left(D + P^T H P\right).$$

This determinant is the sum of the determinants of the matrices we obtain from $P^T H P$ by replacing each subset of columns by the corresponding set from D. Note that D contains poles at θ_j but $P^T H P$ does not. Thus selecting the set of columns corresponding to the non-zero columns of D will provide a unique term whose multiplicity of the pole at θ_j is precisely the rank of $(E_j)_{T,T}$. □

2.4 Lemma. *Given M an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix whose columns are indexed by V, two columns a and b of M are strongly cospectral if and only if*

(i) $\phi_a(x) = \phi_b(x)$ (when this occurs we call u and v cospectral), and

(ii) The poles of $\phi_{ab}(x)/\phi(x)$ are simple.

As a consequence, condition (a) of Theorem 2.1 can be checked in polynomial time on n.

Proof.

> Claim 1: Condition (ii) is equivalent to u and v being parallel, that is, for all r, $E_r \mathbf{e}_a$ being a multiple of $E_r \mathbf{e}_b$ whenever $E_r \mathbf{e}_b \neq 0$.
>
> This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.3.

Claim 2: Condition (i) is equivalent to, for all r, $(E_r)_{a,a} = (E_r)_{b,b}$.

This is due to Godsil and McKay [16].

Rest of the proof: Clearly if a and b are strongly cospectral, then they are parallel. So we proceed to assume that a and b are parallel vertices and show that, in this case, strong cospectrality is equivalent to cospectrality. In fact, E_r is idempotent, thus $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = 0$ if and only if $(E_r)_{a,a} = 0$. So in either case it must be that $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = 0$ if and only if $E_r\mathbf{e}_b = 0$ for all r. Now suppose that $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = \lambda E_r\mathbf{e}_b \neq 0$. Then

$$(E_r)_{a,a} = \lambda(E_r)_{a,b} = \lambda(E_r)_{b,a} = \lambda^2(E_r)_{b,b},$$

thus they are strongly cospectral if and only if they are cospectral.

To finish the proof, we show that both conditions can be checked in polynomial time. Nothing needs to be said about condition (i). For condition (ii), let $g(x)$ be the greatest common divisor of $\phi(x)$ and $\phi_{ab}(x)$. Condition (ii) is equivalent to $f(x) = \phi(x)/g(x)$ being a polynomial without repeated roots, which in turn can be verified by checking whether or not the greatest common divisor of $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ is a constant. □

2.5 Lemma. *Given an $n \times n$ symmetric integer matrix M whose entries belong to $[-n, n]$, condition (b) of Theorem 2.2 can be tested in polynomial time. Moreover, if the conditions passes, the eigenvalues in Θ_a and their corresponding eigenvectors can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. For a column a of M, let

$$f(x) = \frac{\phi(x)}{\gcd(\phi(x), \phi_a(x))}.$$

From Lemma 2.3, we see that $f(x)$ has simple roots, which are precisely the eigenvalues of M that lie in Θ_a. If the degree of $f(x)$ is k, the coefficient of $(-x)^{k-1}$ is the sum of the roots of $f(x)$.

From the assumption that the entries of M are bounded, we have that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{d} \theta_r^2 \leq \operatorname{tr} M^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} M_{ij}^2 \leq n^4,$$

thus the eigenvalues of M lie in the interval $[-n^4, n^4]$. Condition (b) holds if and only if all roots of $f(x)$ are either integers or quadratic integers with

a constant rational term. Because the sum of the eigenvalues is known, the number of possible candidates for the roots of $f(x)$ in the interval $[-n^4, n^4]$ that satisfies condition (b) is a polynomial function on n, therefore we can efficiently check whether $f(x)$ satisfies condition (b), and compute its factorization. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. From Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, conditions (a) and (b) of Theorem 2.2 can be checked efficiently, and if condition (b) holds then Θ_a can be computed efficiently. Upon knowing the elements of Θ_a, the computation of g and of the ratios $(\theta_0 - \theta_r)/(g\sqrt{\Delta})$ can be carried out, remaining only to check whether the signs appearing in condition (c) are compatible. To that effect, it suffices to note that for any eigenvector $\mathbf{x}$ associated to an eigenvalue θ_r such that $\mathbf{x}_a \neq 0$, we have that if $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = E_r\mathbf{e}_b$, then $\mathbf{x}^T E_r \mathbf{e}_a = \mathbf{x}^T E_r \mathbf{e}_b$ and thus $\mathbf{x}_a = \mathbf{x}_b$; and likewise, if $E_r\mathbf{e}_a = -E_r\mathbf{e}_b$, then $\mathbf{x}_a = -\mathbf{x}_b$. □

3 Comments and related open questions

Related work

Chen et al. [6] recently worked on the problem of determining when there is a positive real number t such that, for a given rational matrix M and rational vectors $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, $\mathrm{e}^{tM}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$. There is a clear resemblance to our problem, however our result does not follow from theirs for the following reason. They assume one can compute the Jordan Normal Form and the eigenvectors of a given matrix efficiently, citing the work of Cai [4], who in turn deals with roots of polynomials of degree larger than 4 by computing sufficiently good rational approximations. We note that this approach would not determine whether or not perfect state transfer occurs, but only some arbitrarily good phase-shifted version of it. The fact that we are able to examine the eigenvalues in the support of a column locally (Lemma 2.5), and restrict to the case where such eigenvalues are integers or quadratic integers (Godsil [15, Theorem 6.1]) is key to efficiently determine if perfect state transfer indeed occurs. Also, the fact that they are not considering complex numbers leads them to easily rule out the case $p \neq 0$ of condition (b) in Theorem 2.2, whereas we know that there are infinitely many examples of symmetric matrices admitting perfect state transfer in this case.

Uniform mixing

Given a $n \times n$ integer symmetric matrix M, consider the mixing matrix[2]

$$N(t) = \exp(\mathrm{i}tM) \circ \exp(-\mathrm{i}tM),$$

where the product depicted is the entry-wise matrix product[3]. We say that M admits uniform mixing at a time τ if

$$N(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} J,$$

where J stands for the matrix whose all entries are equal to 1.

Determining whether a matrix admits uniform mixing is a considerably harder problem than that of perfect state transfer, even in the special case where M is the adjacency matrix of a simple graph and its eigenvalues are known (see for instance Godsil et al. [17]). For this reason, we believe a reasonable question here is to determine classes of graphs for which the existence of uniform mixing can be tested in polynomial time. For example:

1. Can we test whether a cubelike graph admits uniform mixing in polynomial time?

Average mixing

Note that $N(t)$ denotes a probability distribution. The average of this distribution can be computed as follows

$$\hat{N}(t) = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T N(t) \mathrm{d}t.$$

As shown in Godsil [14], it follows that, if M admits spectral decomposition $M = \sum_{r=0}^{d} \theta_r E_r$, then

$$\hat{N}(t) = \sum_{r=0}^{d} E_r \circ E_r. \tag{1}$$

The average mixing matrix enjoys interesting properties, notably, it is rational, doubly-stochastic and positive semidefinite. Moreover, two columns of $\hat{N}(t)$ are equal if and only if they are strongly cospectral, a property that, as seen above, can be tested in polynomial time. We therefore ask:

[2] This is usually denoted as $M(t)$, but we are already using M with a different meaning.

[3] Also known as Schur or Hadamard product, or perhaps the bad student product.

2. Given M a symmetric integer matrix, can $\hat{N}(t)$ be computed in polynomial time?

Naturally, as seen from (1), $\hat{N}(t)$ can be computed numerically in polynomial time up to desired precision. However the rationality of $\hat{N}$ suggests there could be a way of doing this computation symbolically.

References

[1] Ethan Ackelsberg, Zachary Brehm, Ada Chan, Joshua Mundinger, and Christino Tamon. "Laplacian State Transfer in Coronas". In: (2015), p. 12. arXiv:1508.05458 (cit. on p. 2).

[2] Milan Bašić. "Characterization of quantum circulant networks having perfect state transfer". In: *Quantum Information Processing* 12.1 (2013), pp. 345–364 (cit. on p. 2).

[3] Sougato Bose. "Quantum Communication through an Unmodulated Spin Chain". In: *Physical Review Letters* 91.20 (2003), p. 207901 (cit. on p. 1).

[4] Jin-Yi Cai. "Computing the Jordan Normal Form exactly for commuting matrices in polynomial time". en. In: *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 05.03n04 (1994), pp. 293–302 (cit. on p. 6).

[5] Ada Chan. "Complex Hadamard Matrices, Instantaneous Uniform Mixing and Cubes". In: *ArXiv e-prints* (2013). arXiv:1305.5811 (cit. on p. 2).

[6] Taolue Chen, Nengkun Yu, and Tingting Han. "Continuous-time orbit problems are decidable in polynomial-time". In: *Information Processing Letters* 115.1 (2015), pp. 11–14 (cit. on p. 6).

[7] Wang-Chi Cheung and Chris D Godsil. "Perfect state transfer in cube-like graphs". In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 435.10 (2011), pp. 2468–2474 (cit. on p. 2).

[8] Matthias Christandl, Nilanjana Datta, Artur Ekert, and Andrew J Landahl. "Perfect State Transfer in Quantum Spin Networks". In: *Physical Review Letters* 92.18 (2004), p. 187902 (cit. on p. 1).

[9] Gabriel Coutinho. "Quantum State Transfer in Graphs". PhD dissertation. University of Waterloo, 2014 (cit. on p. 3).

[10] Gabriel Coutinho and Chris D Godsil. "Perfect state transfer in products and covers of graphs". en. In: *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* (2015), pp. 1–12 (cit. on pp. 1, 2).

[11] Gabriel Coutinho and Henry Liu. "No Laplacian Perfect State Transfer in Trees". en. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 29.4 (2015), pp. 2179–2188 (cit. on p. 2).

[12] Yang Ge, Benjamin Greenberg, Oscar Perez, and Christino Tamon. "Perfect state transfer, graph products and equitable partitions". In: *International Journal of Quantum Information* 9.3 (2011), pp. 823–842 (cit. on p. 2).

[13] Chris D Godsil. *Algebraic Combinatorics*. New York: Chapman & Hall, 1993, pp. xvi+362 (cit. on p. 4).

[14] Chris D Godsil. "Average mixing of continuous quantum walks". In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 120.7 (2013), pp. 1649–1662 (cit. on p. 7).

[15] Chris D Godsil. "When can perfect state transfer occur?" In: *Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra* 23 (2012), pp. 877–890 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 6).

[16] Chris D Godsil and Brendan D McKay. "Spectral conditions for the reconstructibility of a graph". In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 30.3 (1981), pp. 285–289 (cit. on p. 5).

[17] Chris D Godsil, Natalie Mullin, and Aidan Roy. "Uniform Mixing and Association Schemes". In: *ArXiv e-prints* (2013). arXiv:1301.5889 (cit. on p. 7).

[18] Mohamad Ali Jafarizadeh and Rahime Sufiani. "Perfect state transfer over distance-regular spin networks". In: *Physical Review A* 77.2 (2008), p. 22315 (cit. on p. 1).

[19] Alastair Kay. "Perfect, efficient, state transfer and its application as a constructive tool". In: *International Journal of Quantum Information* 8.04 (2010), pp. 641–676 (cit. on p. 2).

[20] Hiranmoy Pal and Bikash Bhattacharjya. "Perfect state transfer on NEPS of the path on three vertices". In: *Discrete Mathematics* 339.2 (2016), pp. 831–838 (cit. on p. 2).

[21] Luc Vinet and Alexei Zhedanov. “How to construct spin chains with perfect state transfer”. In: *Physical Review A* 85.1 (2012), p. 12323 (cit. on p. 2).